on Real Property Assessment outlining the policies of this Government as it relates to assessment. I would like to give some background to our present situation.

In the past, the Government has utilized a method of assessment which reflects 100 per cent market value on land and 1963 building costs on improvements. This means that the land has been assessed at its full value, while improvements have been assessed at much less than their full value. Over the past few years, this has created an inequity in our assessment base causing a major shift in our assessment base from building intensive properties to land intensive properties, often to the benefit of those who are more able to pay as opposed to those who find themselves in a less fortunate position.

Contrary to some public statements, it has been impossible to correct the assessment for the 1979-80 year. It must be clearly understood that the assessment role must be prepared by October 15, of the year preceding the tax year and, therefore, it has not been possible to correct the imbalance for this forthcoming tax year.

Mr. Speaker, the Government will now repeal the present Commissioner's Order pertaining to assessment. This is a major step forward to correcting our present assessment base. A new Commissioner's Order will direct our assessors to adhere to the following principles:

1. The Government of Yukon will retain the responsibility for assessment throughout Yukon. This principle is important to ensure universality of the method of assessment and maintaining equity throughout the Yukon.

2. The assessment rolls in all taxing jurisdictions will be maintained and updated on a continuous basis. This will prevent the problems that have arisen over the past years which can be largely attributed to an inequitable assessment base, an insufficient number of trained assessors and the fact that assessment rolls were only required to be updated every five years.

3. Land will continue to be assessed at market value and will be entered on the assessment rolls at 100 per cent of that value.

4. Assessment for improvements will be calculated on a basis of current replacement costs and will be entered on the assessment roll at 100 per cent of that value. This will be accomplished by adopting the Alberta Manual, but revising it to reflect current Whitehorse building costs. Of course, depreciation and other factors will be applied to the original base figure to keep replacement cost figures current.

The replacement value approach was chosen over the market value concept primarily because:

(a) there are insufficient property sales in the Yukon to establish a market value assessment base, and;

(b) the market values tend to fluctuate considerably in a boom or bust economy, while replacement values are not nearly as susceptible to those fluctuations and can, therefore, provide a more stable assessment base.

5. Provisions will be made to exempt from assessments such things as landscaping, sidewalks, fences, repainting and similar improvements to residential properties. The reason that this section has been included is that there has been a misconception in the minds of the public that improvements of this nature will increase taxation.

With clear delineation of this type of exemption, it will give the incentive for people to improve their homes without the fear of increased taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I have intentionally left out any mention of legislative changes to taxation. Until we have a clear understanding of the shifts which will occur with this new method of assessment, we will not be able to establish a policy for legislative change. We expect, Mr. Speaker, to have this information to the Government approximately May or mid-June. As we all know, the municipalities are responsible for the levying of the general mill rate within their boundaries. The Government is actively engaged in developing the options for changes to the taxation system and we intend to present them to the association of Yukon communities for their views prior
to implementation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Mackay: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Minister for making a statement as has just done and I think that it is commendable that with such speed, under such pressure from opposition that he has managed to come forth so quickly with these changes.

I also note though, that there is, in fact, no legislative changes required for this change and that it is quite obvious, then, that these changes could have been made some time ago with respect to the changes he has indicated.

However, be that as it may, I think that a number of the items that he has enumerated as being changed are good. I think that the Territorial Government should retain the universality of assessments, that they should be updated on an annual basis and that the balancing of land versus improvements is a step forward.

I wish to have heard of some kind of indication of the effect that this switch will have upon the various categories of property and this, no doubt, has been calculated by the Government and, hopefully, it will not impose an immediate strain on other types of property owners at the expense of correcting for the people who have had problems before, that we do not suddenly swing the balance too far the other way. Hopefully, the pendulum will wind up somewhere in the middle and everybody should be paying a fair tax.

I think, that is all I have to say. I will look forward to reading the White Paper and also to discussing with the Minister at some future point, other items which are required to be put forward in the Municipal Ordinance. I am pleased to see that he has taken this immediate action now.

Mr. Penkett: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister well knows, I would have loved to give a long, hour-and-a-half oration on this subject and I want him to know I enjoyed reading the White Paper. I suppose ‘better late than never” is a good description of where we are at the moment, and I am reminded of another expression: “Nothing concentrates a man’s mind like the knowledge that he is going to be hung in the morning”.

I am pleased to see now, from the Government, I think, some fairly precise recognition of the problem, as it has. I am a little uncertain about the Government’s commitment to changing the legislation to view the large number of recommendations that were made by the Miller Committee which covered a whole range of areas in this Ordinance. I think, many of the recommendations made there are still very valid and worth considering.

The Minister has alluded, of course, to the band-aid approach suggested by some, and I am sure that “some” include the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West and I would like to suggest to him that the band-aid was never suggested, but what we were talking about was large plaster cast for a major fracture and it was an emergency operation that was proposed with the amendment to the Municipal Ordinance. However, I am sure we will have a chance to debate that further.

I think that the Minister has made a very good summary of the taxation process, the four stages that are essential. There is one point that I will be returning to when we get into debate and that is the philosophy of property taxation. It is my view and I think that it is the view of the Government of Manitoba, or has been, that property taxes ought only to be used to pay for services to property and that is the origin of that kind of tax and that is the principle on which it should be used. Therefore, I shall probably be engaging in some debate about the appropriateness of using this tax for such things as school and recreation. I am sure that will be an enjoyable debate when we join it.

I am, at this point, I think, slightly concerned about the use of the replacement costings for improvements. I understand the Minister reasons for doing it, but I do hope the market values, at least. will be used as a check on the values in the assessments for the replacement costings because, I think we can still see some distortions the other way.

Generally, I would like to thank the Minister for his statement. I am sure the debate will be, when we get into some legislative changes, enthusiastic and long, and I might say that I look forward to that with enthusiasm. I cannot sit down though, without remarking on the fact that I think it is a pity that we have had to live with this problem for a couple of years now, and that some injustices had to persist, but I do hope that with some swift action this year, we will be able to rectify them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Is the Honourable Member rising on a point of order or a point of privilege?

Mr. Fleming: I am sure that the Member on my right and myself would have loved to comment to the Minister’s statement, but rules prevail.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the Chair can hold that the Honourable Member has raised a point of privilege. Are there any further statements by Ministers? This then brings us to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Native Education

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

In light of yesterday’s press release from the representatives of the Yukon Native community regarding his Department’s attitude in the handling of native education concerns, is the Minister prepared to address this House in response to the demand of his resignation and the subsequent call for a Federal investigation into native education?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of resigning and as for the remainder of the press release, I am sorry, I have not actually read the press release. I have read several interpretations of it but I have not read the actual press release so I am not prepared to comment on the Federal Investigation.

Mr. Byblow: Is the Minister unable to confirm that the allegations of the press release respecting Native treatment by his Department of Native Education were accurate?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think that I have a fairly good idea of what the Honourable Member is getting at. I would like to assure this House that it is the Department of Education’s intent to pursue an active role of the native groups within the Yukon Territory. To this end, Mr. Speaker, we have developed a paraprofessional training, a paraprofessional program for classroom assistance. This is basically a native program to have a native present in the classroom in rural schools.

We have developed a language research program. We have contracted this to the Council for Yukon Indians. Mr. Speaker, we are also attempting to develop a program of cultural research which we hope we will be able to contract out to the YNB in the future. We also have the remedial tutor program which also provides the native identity, especially in the rural schools.

We have, coming up in the oncoming year, an optional course on native mythology at the grade 8 and 10 levels. This is a course developed in conjunction with the YNB and, hopefully, this program will continue in Yukon schools. We have also developed a policy of giving innovative grants to teachers in the Yukon, especially in the outlying areas, to provide dollars for programs geared to local conditions.

The Department also hopes to continue the professional development of teachers in areas such as teaching English as a second language and teaching in a cross-cultural situation and it is also this Department’s intention to consult, on an ongoing basis, with local band councils as well as school committees in rural areas.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are rejecting the native content in our schools. We are attempting to accommodate Indian interests as much as we possibly can and it is my Department’s intention to pursue that course.

Mr. Byblow: Is the Minister aware that in British Columbia, a Department of Indian Education exists within the Ministry to address special curriculum concerns in education and will his Department be using that source for its own inspiration?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, we are willing to accept information from any source that we can get. At the basic time, our Department is not big enough, and I can remember hearing just a little while ago in the Budget debate where the Members opposite felt that, in fact, the Administration was too large as it presently is so, we are going to depend on the YNB and the CIV to give us a lot of input into native programming that we hope to continue in Yukon Schools.

Question re: Abusive Remark to Chief Danny Joe

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minis-
ter of Education. Mr. Speaker, is the Minister quite prepared to apologize publicly to Chief Danny Joe of the Selkirk Band for the crude and abusive remark that was put to the Chief by the Minister and was made public?

Hon. Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think, I know which remark the Honourable Member opposite is speaking of. I seem to remember making such a remark. I have the horrible tendency to do so. If, in fact, Mr. Joe had taken this remark as I intended it, he would not have felt offended because I, in no way, intended a slur on his reputation. If he took it that way, then I am very happy to apologize, to not only Danny Joe, but also to the Vice-President of the YNB who was present at that time. I did not intend, in any way, that remark towards the YNB or their representatives.

Question re: Land for Sale in Whitehorse

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. Can the Minister tell us how many developed lots are presently held by the Government for sale in Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have not had a recent update. I think the total amount is forty and that is a combination of country/residential, residential and there may be one or two commercial in that as well.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Will it be possible for the general public to buy these lots within the next few months before the building season begins?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am just reviewing that at the present time.

Question re: Dawson City Administrator's Report

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to table in the House, the report of the Administrator of Dawson City, Joe Oliver, now that his work is about completed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the official report from the Administrator. I expect it within the next day or two.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some of the observations and findings of the Administrator may have some bearing on the Dawson City Municipal Election, would the Minister be prepared to make that report public before the election day in Dawson City?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it would depend when the report was received and also, at the same time, with respect to my officers having the ability to review it.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Final supplementary on that: there has been a considerable concern expressed in Dawson City concerning the electoral rules and the method in which the Council has been elected. Has the Minister given any thought to reviewing the situation and trying to get a proper election in place as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the situation. It is my understanding that the way the election has proceeded up to now, has run properly under the Municipal Ordinance, it is a question of interpretation concerning some of the decisions that were made at the local evaluation. As I am concerned, it will proceed. If people do have problems with the election, there is a controversy procedure that can be followed.

Question re: Tourism Convention in California

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. It has come to my attention that the Minister may have erred in telling me, in a previous question, that only his expenses were being absorbed by YTG in his recent California junket. Could the Minister confirm what expenses were incurred by YTG for the trip?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did err. I told the Minister that YTG was only paying my costs, where in fact, the Commissioner’s costs were coming out of the YTG budget.

The total cost for the trip to California was somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,000. I do not know the exact sum. The total costs for the whole package picked up by the province of Alberta and part of the North is in the neighborhood of $85,000. So we got a pretty cheap go at it.

Mr. Byblow: Would the Minister be prepared to assess the value of the trip toward Territorial tourism benefit?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, it would be almost impossible to assess the value. All we can do is say that it was beneficial to the Yukon Territory and we expect to get full value for our dollar out of it. To put a final evaluation, that would be impossible to do. The dollar value might not come for two or three years, we do not know.

Question re: Whitehorse Inn

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Yesterday, the Government Leader made a speech to the Chamber of Commerce, in which he referred to the demise of the Whitehorse Inn. He mentioned, at that time, that he had unforgettable memories of this place, and in view of the dubious reputation of the Whitehorse Inn and the Government Leader, could he perhaps share these memories with us?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must declare that that question is frivolous and quite out of order.

As there appears to be no further questions, we will proceed to the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: We will go to Orders of the Day, Motions other than Government Motions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 1 standing in the name of Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item Number 1?

Mr. Hanson: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that the Administration along with the appropriate funding of all natural resources in Yukon be transferred to the Government of Yukon and that amendments to related federal regulations and legislation be made on the advice of the Government of Yukon and that active negotiations commence immediately on the transfer of the appropriate legislative authority to the Government of Yukon.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to talk long on this subject. It has, from what I gather, gone before the House before and it has been passed and that is where it died. But this time, seeing that there have been so many different parties and Independents will be voting for this Motion.

The purpose of this is for the Minister for Economic Development who is going to Yellowknife next week for the Resource Advisory Board Council, the last meeting, will have a mandate from this Government to ask for start negotiations now for the transfer of these resources in our hands.

I could stand all day and say what the benefit of this transfer would be to the Yukon, but I am quite sure that everyone in this House realizes what it would do for this country to get our resources in our hands.

Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, in our drive for more responsible government for the Yukon, it is considered vital to us that the administration of all our natural resources be in the hands of Yukoners, Yukoners who have been elected by the people of the Yukon and not someone from thousands of miles away, who has no direct interest in Yukon except to ensure for himself and his fellow Canadians from the provinces that they not only have the benefits of their provincial resources but also the benefits of the vast resources North of 60.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that Indian land claims will be and should be an important factor in any turnover of resource responsibility, but if we are to have more responsible government it is necessary that we not only have the administration of these resources. We must also own these resources. After all, who should own them, the residents of the area or the residents of the rest of Canada? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people who live and work in the Territory should own their own resources as the residents of the provinces do.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we feel that it is imperative that negotiations begin immediately for the ownership of these resources. We hear much about resource revenue sharing banded about in the Liberal Party in Ottawa.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a game in which the only loser would ultimately be the Yukon. We should be very wary of resource revenue sharing, for once we have entered into any such agreement, we would find it very hard to negotiate for our rightful ownership of these resources.

Last month while in Vancouver I approached the Assistant Deputy Minister with regard to transferring of resources to the YTG. At that time, he stated that resource revenue sharing would be more satisfactory to the Federal Government. I would suggest that whenever the question of resource transfer comes up, we are going to hear the same lines over and over. However, nothing less than ownership is satisfactory to us as a majority in the Legislative
Assembly and I would certainly hope that nothing less would be satisfactory to the Opposition. Therefore, I support this motion, Mr. Speaker, and, furthermore, I will be going to Yellowknife this coming week to support the mining community in the North, in their bid for local control. The Government of the Northwest Territories has been doing the same before, but the Northern Mineral Advisory Committee holds its final meeting before turning their report into the Minister.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, when I first read this motion, I think that I probably read it in a manner which the Honourable Member from Mayo intended me to read it and that was a fairly straightforward motion that everybody would support that question. I think that that was the assumption that was made across the way. But I have to rise again as I have in the past in this House and point out that there are other considerations other than what we want here.

The consideration is plainly that this motion, if passed by this Government, by this House, would clearly impinge upon the land claim negotiations that are presently being held. I have to think of it as a most insensitive time, at this time, and in this place for us to be negotiating this kind.

It is clear in the minds of the Government that what we are talking about is not merely the administration but the ownership of these assets. It is very clear from what the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development just said, that is the purpose of this motion. It is cloaked in terms of "we should just take over the administration so we will get to use it," but the real issue is the ownership and I am not prepared to discuss the ownership of these resources at this time, because I think that it would be a provocation. I think that kind of thing is best handled at the negotiating table and the land claims and if the Members opposite do not think that this kind of subject will come up at land claims, I suggest they think again.

The other motive, perhaps, for having this motion on the floor, at this time, was to gain political points, to be able to say that had a government in Ottawa is withholding our resources from the true owners. That is probably a pretty sensible thing to do if you are fighting a federal election campaign.

I do not think that any of us are particularly interested in fighting a federal election campaign in this House, so I cannot see what good political points being scored in this one will do. I can argue and I will argue. I can do my job in this House but I cannot use this House to get into a debate that should be taken elsewhere.

I think, as we said many times, during the campaign last Fall, what is required now is, number One, the settlement of Indian land claims. Everybody said that. Number Two, how do you do that? Well, of course, we all agreed that there must be the proper atmosphere of trust and cooperation established to do that.

To blunder into this kind of subject in the midst of reopening of land claims negotiations, to blunder in, Mr. Speaker, at this time, is not being sensitive to the required atmosphere.

I, therefore, will make no hesitation in voting against this because, nowhere in it there any recognition of the land claims issue. If there had been some in this motion, I do not think that I would have had much difficulty supporting it because the principles involved of ultimate control of Yukoners of their resources does not meet with any problem in this Party, here.

Where it does have a problem is in the timing. The sensitivity displayed in producing this motion is a real problem because it indicates, deep down, are the Members opposite really serious about negotiations in good faith with the Indian people?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the motion. I notice that the Honourable Member of the Opposition has tied in the Yukon Indian claims with the motion and I think that with every motion that comes before the House, there is going to be an attempt by the Opposition to try to tangle the motions that are discussed within this Legislature.

Just recently, Mr. Speaker, I opposed a motion put forward by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs regarding the Territorial Government taking over lands mainly because it is jeopardizing the Indian people, and more particularly, my constituency and I mentioned specifically, also other areas in the Yukon. But this motion does not, in any way, in any form, in any way, in any previous motion that I opposed.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to let Ottawa control the resources whether it is natural, whether they are renewable or non-renewable, if the natives negotiate with Ottawa, then I feel, from past experience, that the Federal Government would not release as much as the natives are asking for with regard to resource revenue in Yukon Territory.

Speaking on resource revenue sharing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to specify that there are resource revenue sharing going on in different parts of Canada and here in the Yukon, for instance, if we do have resource revenue sharing it would be the Yukon Territorial Government and the Federal Government, whereas, if the negotiations took place then it would be a third party which is not inconsistent with the Opposition's policies.

Based on those facts, Mr. Speaker, also being the first Indian to sit on the Government side of this House, it makes it difficult for me to speak with good judgement in concerns such as these. So it puts me in a position where I have to make good judgment on my part as an Indian for the best development of this Territory for the future of the people of the Territory.

I would like to stress also, Mr. Speaker, when I speak to this motion, I am an advocate of the one Government system and I believe that this could work if the native people sit down now, which I think, is a position where I have to make good judgement on my part as an Indian for the best development of this Territory for the future of the people of the Territory.

If we do that, there will be nothing left to negotiate. The Honourable Member from Whitehorse, Riverdale South and the Member from Old Crow, would not benefit in any way, shape or form from resources if we are speaking of the Federal Government continuing the ownership of resources in the Yukon Territory.

Based on those observations, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to support the motion.

Mr. Byliew: Mr. Speaker, I must express that I have some very fundamental reservations about the motion as it stands. I agree with it in principle, because it is inevitable that it must take place, but I think, at this time, it is too premature and too ill prepared to really be taken seriously and, as such, I will take a slightly different approach to discussing the motion than some of the previous speakers.

In the past several weeks we have been discussing a number of things. We have raised questions. We have debated. We have proposed various concerns related to economic development. We talked about resource development strategy. We have talked about planning transportation and energy grids and corridors of development, and were lead to believe that there is a plan for the Territory's future growth and development. That it is being thought of, and it is being articulated into a document.

At the same time, as pointed out by the Minister, we are entering into discussions with interested investors, we are sitting on Federal committees along with industry and we have our own Territorial Government developing our concerns. This is the point I would like to make. This motion implicates industry and, specifically, the mining industry because it is to that industry to whom the motion will have any implication, if and when natural resources are transferred.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we should be so naive or, on the contrary, think that we do not have the responsibility as Yukoners, to ensure that we can participate in land claims, that we can permit a pipeline to be constructed, and expect mining, our primary industry, to continue.

There is a problem here. It has already been pointed out that a price will have to be paid to assume the responsibility. To date, we can boast of nothing more than being an advisory capacity respecting the resources, that we can participate in land claims, that we can permit a pipeline to be constructed, and expect mining, our primary industry, to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that we would be laughed out of any courtroom if we present that kind of case, the way we are presenting it now.

Do we really think that we can encourage resource development without the Federal concessions that are possible now? Do you think that this is going to attract a mine into production with the tax breaks that has had to be the case, for example, Anvil did not come on stream? You could not, you could not do that. Why? Because you would need every possible cent to pay for the infrastructure, to pay for the services that you have already got in place, not to mention the ones that you will still need.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the thinking here is that if you have full control of your natural resources, you can increase your revenue, you can improve your fiscal position and deliver a better quality of service to you taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that
nary reality, if we really expect any "no strings attached" au-
toion and I repeat the concerns that were  expressed earlier. Where
for land development that, by predicating land claims to that mo-
tion, and I do.  Control of our natural  resources is an evolutio­
rangement.

I now submit, Mr. Speaker, that you would have to pick up that
twenty-odd million someplace, and if you intend to maintain your
level of service, I fail to see what plan is in store to make that
difference.

If you try and hit the industry for greater taxation or royalties for the
service, for the resource that they are extracting, whether that
is in mining or in energy, or forestry, you are effectively eliminat­
ing them from existence. Industry will go where the buck is and it
will not be here. If you try to hit average Joe Citizen for twenty-odd
million, I dare say that 23,000 people are not going to be prepared to
cough up a $1,000 bucks to make that difference.

I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the real thrust of this
Government is for development, and I think we are going to have
to show more long term planning and fiscal accountability. This
motion does not show that. I suppose though, that like the pro­
vinces, Yukon will be going, cap  m  hand, as a have-not, for the
motion does not show that. I  suppose though, that  like  the pro­
vinces pointed this out, this House amended a motion that called
the position of this House, I believe,  would  be an irresponsible
deal with the consequences that will  result from the passing of this
motion again, saying absolutely nothing other than we just take
over and if the land claims are settled, we deal with the native
problem once again as a Yukon Territory.

I do not think that you are going to find the people, about a third,
or quarter of the people in the Yukon Territory, especially in the
native area, that are going to agree with that.

I just cannot support the motion. These motions have been here
before. I have been here for almost five years. I have seen the same
motion a dozen times around this House. In the first while I was
here, we used to pass these motions without thought of the land
claim issue pretty well as they did not get anywhere at that time.
The last two that I was here, I am but must rate them. I always referred to the claims and made sure that we did not just
pass a motion as they were going to try to pass the other day, and
we had it amended. This motion was amended to take into consid­
eration the Land Claims Settlement and to be acted upon imme­
diately after that. I will be in full support of it, but not as we
stand today.

Mr. Falle: Mr. Speaker, I have sat here today, and I have listened
to the land claims being brought up. I would like the people to
remember our platform on land claims. It is a priority, but it is a
fair and just settlement for all Yukoners.

One of our main reasons, I think, that we are the majority gov­
ernment, because we consider all Yukoners in the  House  negotia­
tion. It must be fair for us all. On and on this side of the House, we
are going to do our best to go ahead with development and we definitely
hope we get the cooperation of all Yukoners.

We cannot jeopardize every person in the Yukon and come to a
solid stop because somebody in Vancouver, Ottawa, who is sitting on
the negotiating table, refuses to budge. We have to keep the
Yukon moving forward and we are going to.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, without having control of our resources,
we are not much more than a puppet government. We have no
control over our money matters, no control over the land which so
many people want and they come to the Government every day,
"When are we going to get land?" Well, we have not got it to give
them or to sell them, a little wee bit, that is about all, but I would
like to state that I am definitely in full support of this motion. We
have to get control of our resources and our mines.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the discussion has been quite
interesting. Once again, we are getting back to a couple of old saws
that I have been sitting patiently in this House listening to during
the course of our debates. The major one I think I would like to
dispell. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic, I believe, should be defeated. In fact, I suggest that perhaps it should be
even removed from the record to show our responsibility.

Mrs. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I rise in protest of this motion as well.
Mr. Speaker, is that when it comes to land

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has repeatedly told
us that his Government's priorities are land claims, pipelines and
economic development, in that order. I maintain that the economic
development priority has to be more gradual, more accountable,
more planned and more responsible, and is not ready yet for this
move.

Mr. Speaker, this then is essentially my position. It is a prema­
ture motion. Like the provinces that entered into Confederation
since 1867, the need for more federal aid now in developing those
natural resources is vital. If we are going to gain control of those
resources it is not the right move now. I think that we need more
producing resources on stream, we need our own hydro

electric development. I think, we need some planned economic
development. We need an inventory of the resources we have got,
then we will run our own show.

If some of these things can be negotiated in the next few years,
Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to support and even help develop the
realities of that motion, but right now, Mr. Speaker, this motion, I
believe, should be defeated. In fact, I suggest that perhaps it should be
even removed from the record to show our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here, today, is quite probably
a negotiable item in the land claims talks and if this is the case, it
should be debated at the negotiating table.

I have no doubt in my mind that this item was simply plucked from
the negotiating table and laid before the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am charging this Government with a direct
breach of confidence of the debate about land claims issues. If this
motion is passed in this House today, I hope you are prepared to
deal with the consequences that will result from the passing of this
motion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Minister of Health and Welfare
that I have no problem in judgement.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I also, will be rising in non-
support of this motion. I only have to read the first two lines, "That
administration along with the appropriate funding of all natural
resources, if that means exactly what it says, all natural re­

sources. I refer back to the Land Claims Settlement where possibly
land, that you do not have resources without land, it is going to
apply to both.

As has been said here before, we have passed a motion in this
House before, and it had it amended because of the very same
thing. In this House, I just did
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that relationship, those linkages between those things has to be made very clear.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to correct the Member who has just finished speaking. He said earlier in his debate that I voted for gun control. I want to make it very clear that I did not vote for gun control. I voted for a program that we had no choice but to administer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member has not raised a point of privilege. It would appear to the Chair that there seems to be an allegation of fact between two Members, which, of course, as all Members know, does not constitute a prima facie point of privilege.

Dr. Hiebert: Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adjourn debate on Motion Number 19.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I second that.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse South Centre, seconded by the Honourable Member from Whitehorse West that debate on this motion be now adjourned.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Clerk: Item Number 2, standing in the name of Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item Number 2 at this time?

Mr. Fleming: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

We will then proceed to Government bills and orders.

PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, item number 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Tracey.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development.

Bill Number 11: Third Reading

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 11, An Ordinance to Amend the Dental Profession Ordinance be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 11 be now read a third time.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title of the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 11 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that Bill Number 11 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: I shall declare that Bill number 11 has passed this House.

I would like to advise the House that we are prepared to receive the Commissioner in her capacity as the Lieutenant Governor to give Assent to certain Bills which have passed this House.

Madam Commissioner enters the Chambers announced by the Sergeant At-Arms

Mr. Speaker: Madam Commissioner, the Assembly has passed a number of Bills to which, and in the name and on behalf of the Assembly, I respectfully request your Assent.

Mr. Clerk: Northern Natural Gas Pipeline Agreement Ordinance, Firearms Administration Agreement Ordinance, An Ordinance to Amend the Dental Profession Ordinance.

Madam Commissioner: Mr. Speaker, as this wholly elected Assembly has received, debated and passed this Legislation, I hereby Assent to the Bills enumerated by the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I rise, at this time, to seek unanimous consent of the House to waive Standing Order Number 99, for the purpose of proceeding with motions respecting the adjournment of the House and the appointment to the Water Board.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed then, with Motions as referred to in the suggestion by the Honourable Leader of the Government.

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I will read the Motion I made earlier. This House recommends to the Minister of Indian and Northern Development, the appointment of Mr. Clifford Geddes to the Yukon Territorial Water Board for a further three years.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, that this House recommends to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development the appointment of Mr. Clifford Geddes to the Yukon Territorial Water Board for a further three year term. Is there any debate?

Hon. Mr. Mackay: If there was a way of “thirding” this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would do so, however, I would like to say that I do thoroughly endorse this appointment.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: We will then proceed to Government motions. The Honourable Leader of the Government, are you prepared to proceed at this time?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Leader of the Government, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Government Leader, that the public interest requires that the House do not sit. Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and that in the event of Mr. Speaker’s being unable to act owing to illness or other causes, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order. Is there any debate?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to rise in opposition to this motion; however, I have a few comments I would like to make.

As you know, any motion to adjourn the House means that we should have done considerable business and we are now leaving for a recess until such time as we are needed by the people of the Yukon Territory, or by the Government, to return to this House for more business.

As we know, there has been a new government, new Ministers and so forth, and I feel that they do need time to come forward with legislation and work for this House and, therefore, possibly they have not had enough time to do some things that we may have asked to have done in the past few years.

They are aware of most of the problems. I would only hope that we do sit again in the not too distant future because I feel that we, as MLAs in the Yukon Territory, and I include all MLAs and Ministers, are here to do the best we can for the people who we are supposedly representing. I feel that a Government that does not sit and have the views, especially the views from the Opposition to work on, will never do any fantastic things for the Yukon.

I am sure that we may hold up the business in some ways, but I am also sure that we will be giving advice that is much needed. As I said, I hope that it will not be too long; there was some business I let pass here, this morning that I would have liked to go through. But to help the way along and see that the Government can get their business done and their work done and come back with some legislation, I am quite willing to let that pass until such time as we sit again.

I hope we do not have to wait too long for the next sitting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Njoelti: Mr. Speaker, for the first time, on adjournment of such a Session within the Government of the Yukon Territory, I would just like to make a couple of comments.

It has been an experience for me to participate in such a session. I appreciated it and I enjoyed it. This break will give me more time to work with my particular departments and also in my constituency.

I feel that while we are recessing, that the native people should consider seriously the land claims negotiations and they should come to an agreement in principle as soon as possible so that the subject would not apprehend all of our legislative works here in the next few years.
Hon. Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I seem to have risen from my seat more than most during this session and I hope that the Members opposite have not got too tired of hearing my voice. I would just like to say that I, also, have enjoyed this first session and I have also appreciated very much the advice from the senior Member of the Opposition from Campbell on the matters as we went through them.

I would like to say that the Government should feel free to advise, Mr. Speaker, in consultation with all the various other people, to call back the Assembly at the earliest possible moment should there be any break at all in terms of land claims, in terms of White Pass doing something precipitous, in terms of a pipeline proposal or a Heritage Fund, or any such negotiations that they feel this Assembly may be able to assist them in. These are the kinds of things that I hope would be in the public interest, in the Government’s mind, to reassemble this group.

I think that there is probably a lot of work to be done by the Government, getting together the legislative package. I hope, it will be done as expeditiously as they can. We are ready to sit as soon as they are, anytime.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hootalinqua, that we do now adjourn.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned.

(Adjourned)
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